

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to the specification and claims to simply overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2-5 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, the claims have been amended. Withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ninness et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. By way of the present response, Claim 1

has been cancelled, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ninness et al. in view of Dimmer. This rejection is respectfully traversed. By way of the present response, the dependency of Claims 6 and 7 has been changed to depend now from rewritten Claim 2, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 2-5 and 8-12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the claims to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, Claims 2-12 should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: JUNE 25, 2004

By: Jeffrey L. Snyder
Stanley M. Erjavac, Reg. No. 38,442
Jeffrey L. Snyder, Reg. No. 43,141

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JLS/smb